



REMARKS

ON

A LATE PAMPHLET,

ENTITLED

“ THE GROUNDS, ON WHICH THE CHURCH OF
ENGLAND SEPARATED, FROM THE
CHURCH OF ROME,

Reconsidered by Shute, Bishop of Durham.”

BY THE AUTHOR

OF

The “ Remarks on the Bishop of Durham's Charge.”

Πειθωμεθα τῷ θεῷ, καὶ μηδὲν ἀντιλεγόμεν, καὶ ἐναντίῳ
εἶναι δοκῇ τοῖς ἡμετέροις λογισμοῖς καὶ τοῖς ὀφείσι το λεγο-
μένων· ὁ μὲν γὰρ λόγος αὐτῇ ἀπαρалоγιστός· ἡ δὲ αἰσθησις
ἡμῶν εὐεξαπατητός. Ἐπεὶ ἐν ὁ λόγος φησί, τοῦτο ἐστὶ τὸ
σῶμα μὲν, καὶ πειθωμεθα καὶ πιστεύωμεν.

Χρυσός. ὁμ. πβ. εἰς Ματ

London :

Printed by W. Clowes, Northumberland-court, Strand,
For Joseph Booker, New Bond-street: and sold by Keatings
and Co. Duke-street, Grosvenor-square: and also by
Todd, York: Sharrocks, Preston: and Bell,
Quayside, Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

1809.

REMARKS
ON
THE INTRODUCTORY LETTER
TO
THE CLERGY
OF
THE DIOCESE OF DURHAM.

NO minister of the God of peace has ever attempted to disseminate religious discord, who did not feel, or affect to feel, himself actuated by the most holy and edifying motives. In controversy, as in war, the aggressor is always eager to justify the aggression. It is not the lust of power, the thirst for preferment, the desire of revenge, or any earthly consideration, that urges him to the attack: the faith which he has bound himself to defend is in danger: an imperious necessity compels him to detect the artifices and expose the sophistry of its enemies. Thus is religion, the best gift of God to man, frequently identified with the worst passions of the human breast.

This observation does not, cannot, apply to the Bishop of Durham. The benevolence of that prelate's character is a sufficient guarantee for the up-

rightness of his intentions. He was indeed the aggressor in this controversy. He began by preaching a crusade against the opinions of his catholic brethren, and then declared that the war, which he waged, should be an eternal war, a *bellum usque ad internecionem* (1). He first pronounced us enemies to the honour of God the Father, to the mediatorship of God the Son, and to the sanctifying influences of the Holy Spirit (2); and afterwards condemned us of the guilt of idolatry, of blasphemy, and of sacrilege (3). But, though these were grievous charges, no one doubted that the right reverend prelate was impelled by motives, which would justify his conduct. What these motives were, indeed, we knew not; but we gave him credit for them.

The bishop, however, in his Introductory Letter, has thought proper to enter into an explanation: and that explanation has disclosed a motive, for which the catholics will be grateful. "There is," he says, "some danger, lest, under a misconstrued indulgence to the popish petitions, we should, by an appearance of indifference to our own church, give countenance to doctrines and usages, which, as sincere protestants, and readers of our Bible, we must ever hold to be idolatrous, blasphemous, and sacrilegious (4)." Some readers of the Bible, perhaps, may wonder what religious doctrines can have to do with petitions for political privileges; "what concord there can be between Christ and Belial." But, not to press this subject here, I may ask, when the Bishop of Durham gave to the catholic petitions any indulgence that could be misconstrued? He has

(1) The Grounds, &c. by Shute, Bishop of Durham, p. 9.

(2) Charge to the Clergy of the Diocese of Durham, p. 5.

(3) The Grounds, &c. p. 8.

(4) Ibid.

uniformly opposed them. I conceive, therefore, that his words cannot refer to the past, but must allude to his future conduct. They imply a promise of future support to the catholic petitions, and an anxiety lest this alteration in his political, should be taken for an alteration in his religious, sentiments. For this he certainly deserves our thanks. We shall willingly purchase the enmity of his pen for the favour of his vote. Let him as a legislator support our cause, and he shall be at liberty as a writer to condemn our doctrines. His censure can do them little injury : his vote may contribute to break the chains of our political thralldom.

I do not, however, see, how to support the catholic petitions can be construed to betray an indifference to the church of England. I think it shews a strict adherence to the great principle on which the church of England was founded. That principle was the right of private judgment: the obligation which binds every man to search the Scriptures, and to embrace every doctrine which he discovers in them. But, if I have an equal right with you to judge for myself, what right have you to punish me for dissenting from you? If I believe Christ to be really present in the eucharist, and you believe him to be present by faith only, what is there in my opinion that should incapacitate me, or in yours that should qualify you, for civil employment? For our religious opinions we are answerable to God alone: "who art thou that judgest," or rather punishest, "another man's servant? to his own master he standeth or falleth."

With much orthodox charity the bishop proceeds to lock the gates of Paradise against the great majority of the Christian world. As if Christ had died for the insular church of England alone, he boldly pronounces, that hardly any one, who professes the same doctrine with the church of Rome, can reason-

ably hope to enjoy the benefit of our common redemption (5). In this view of the case, the fate of the English catholics is peculiarly severe. Our conscientious adherence to what we conceive to be the doctrine of Christ excludes us from the privileges of our birthright here, and the same will exclude us from the joys of heaven hereafter. All the good things, both of this world and of the next, appear to be reserved for the professors of the established creed. In the Gospel originally preached by our blessed Lord, if the poor man was refused the crumbs that fell from the rich man's table in this life, in that to come he might expect to be raised to an equality at least with his proud oppressor : in the new Gospel of the Bishop of Durham we are not only refused all share of the crumbs now, but are condemned to remain in a similar state of degradation for ever hereafter. But it was not only the fear of appearing indifferent to the church of England that prompted the bishop to publish his last pamphlet : he informs us that he was urged by another, and, perhaps, more efficacious, motive : he wished to chastise the insolence of the remarker, who had applied the opprobrious term of *points at issue* to the subjects discussed in the bishop's charge (6). If this be a crime of high treason against the established creed, I must plead guilty ; though the words were certainly employed without the remotest idea of giving offence to the orthodox feelings of my adversary. The reader, however, may possibly be at a loss to conceive in what the offence consists. The right reverend prelate shall inform him. These doctrines are not *points at issue*, he exclaims, they have been decided long ago (7). Decided long ago ! Had such an assertion fallen from a catholic writer, I should not

(5) The Grounds, &c. p. 3.

(6) Ibid. p. 9.

(7) Ibid.

have been surprised. He indeed believes that they were decided long ago, many centuries before the birth of the present church of England. But that a protestant prelate, whose creed is the offspring of private judgment, should thus attempt to check the freedom of religious inquiry, this, indeed, does excite my astonishment. But how have these subjects been decided? "By the establishment of the protestant church," is his answer (8). This is still more singular. Were I to draw a parallel between the establishment of the protestant church, and the miraculous diffusion of Christianity in the first centuries, the reader would see with what reason the former might be adduced as an argument in favour of its creed. There was, as I have before had occasion to observe, too much of human policy and human passion, too much of intrigue, sacrilege, and impiety, in the establishment of that church, to make it a test of the religion of the God of all holiness. As well might the disciple of Mahomet adduce the establishment of the Koran in proof of the divine mission of his prophet.

As, however, the right reverend prelate proceeded in his pamphlet, he made a new discovery, and found that the decision of these subjects rested, not, as he had before taught, on the establishment of the protestant church, but on the authority of an infallible tribunal, composed of Luther and Melancthon, of Whitaker and Jewell, of Chillingworth, Wake, and Stillingfleet (9). This too is strange, passing strange. Does then the learned prelate think that I cannot also produce, on my side of the question, a list of names equally illustrious? Has he forgotten, or is he ignorant, that to these champions of protestantism was opposed a phalanx of writers

(8) The Grounds, &c. p. 9.

(9) Ibid. p. 25.

every way their equals in learning, abilities, and judgment? But, if authority be the weapon with which we are to contend, I shall not be satisfied with the decisions of a few individuals: I shall confidently appeal to the consent of the great body of Christians; and not only of those churches which are in communion with the church of Rome, but also to the Oriental churches, which, for more than ten centuries, have been separated from her. And with such a mass of authority in my favour, am I to be scared with the names of Luther and Melancthon, of Whitaker and Jewell, of Chillingworth, Wake, and Stillingfleet?

But I am surprised that the bishop, in summing up his authorities, should have omitted one far more formidable than any which he has mentioned; the authority of that illustrious doctor under whom Luther studied his theology. I shall endeavour to supply the omission: and, reader, if thou feel disposed to doubt the truth of the narrative, remember that I do no more than transcribe the words of the “magnanimous parent of the Reformation.” He committed it to writing for the benefit and edification of his disciples: and I have often wondered why no orthodox clergyman has ever drawn it from the obscurity of the language in which it is concealed, and published it in an English version, that the unlearned might enjoy the happiness of reading the new Gospel in their native tongue. The fact, as related by Luther, is this. One night, just as the clock struck twelve, Satan tapped him on the shoulder as he lay in his bed (1), and with a deep hollow voice addressed him

(1) As Luther did not choose, I am unable, to inform the reader of the name or rank of this controversial devil. The German apostle, however, appears to have received frequent visits from the inhabitants of the infernal regions. Some of them, he informs us, were malicious devils, who cracked his nuts, and rolled empty barrels down stairs while he slept.

as follows:—"Hark ye, right learned Doctor Martin, do not you know, that, for these last fifteen years, you have been in the daily habit of saying private masses? Now, what if all this while you have been daily committing acts of idolatry; and, instead of the body and blood of Christ, have adored, and exhibited to others to adore, nothing but bread and wine?" To this serious question, the father of the Reformation very learnedly replied—"I am a priest, I was ordained by a true bishop, I acted according to the commands of my superiors; why then should I not be said to have truly consecrated, as I pronounced the words diligently, and said the masses devoutly?" To convince him of his error, Satan adduced six very cogent arguments, which went to prove that he was not a priest, and of course had not the power of consecrating. Luther felt their force, and could only murmur, that he had acted in the name of the church, and that if he had not any true faith himself, at least the church had. "Nonsense!" exclaimed Satan: "tell me where it is written, that a sinner and an infidel can consecrate the body and blood of Christ (2)?" But it cannot be necessary that I should relate the whole of this very edifying discussion. Suffice it to say, that Luther was at last convinced, by the reasoning of his infernal

Others were good-natured devils, who attended him in his walks by day, and went to bed with him at night. But there were two, whom he so admired for their abilities and erudition, that he declared "they could not be every-day devils: they were marvellous devils, probably doctors of divinity in the universities below." *Non vulgares sed magni dæmones, imo doctores theologiæ inter diabolos.* (Colloq. Mensal. Germ. edit. fol. 275. See the whole of that strange work.) And it is on the authority of this madman, that the Bishop of Durham would have me believe that the points in discussion between the two churches have been decided!!!

(2) The whole conference is narrated by Luther himself in his book, *De Missa privata et Unctione sacerdotum*, edit. Wittenb. tom. 7. fol. 228. It is in the sixth tome of the Jena edition, fol. 28.

master. He not only adopted the devil's opinion on this subject, but inculcated it with his usual vehemence in Germany: it has since been confirmed by an act of parliament in England. However, whether we admit or reject the validity of the reasons before mentioned, they have induced the Bishop of Durham to publish a pamphlet against the catholic doctrine of the eucharist: and that pamphlet he has thought proper to entitle, *The Grounds, on which the Church of England separated from the Church of Rome, reconsidered.* In the days when controversy flourished, the art of composing titles was no trifling acquirement; and by their proficiency in it, many of our predecessors obtained no small degree of reputation (3). If the right reverend prelate has not equalled them in quaintness of expression, he has at least surpassed them in originality of invention. Their titles pointed out the contents of their books: he has given to his book a title, which bears no reference to a single line contained in it. The title professes to be the grounds on which the church of England separated from the church of Rome: the book is composed of arguments to disprove the real presence in the eucharist, and to explain an answer in the church catechism. Certainly I shall not be told, that the catholic doctrine, respecting the eucharist, was one of the grounds on which the separation of the two churches was effected. Such an assertion would be to give the lie to the unanimous voice of historians. The true ground of the separation was the passion of Henry the Eighth for the accomplished, but unfortunate, Ann Boleyn. Paul, of a persecutor, became an apostle of the Gospel: and the lust of Henry generated the independence of

(3) Thus, among our more ancient controvertists, we have, "The Gagger gagged, or a new Gag for an old Goose"---"The Romish Fisher caught in his own Net"---"Maister Whyte dyed blacke"---"A Currycomb for a Coxcomb"---"A Pair of Spectacles for Sir Humphrey Hynde to see his Way withal"---"A Case for a Pair of Spectacles," &c. &c.

the English church. To raise his mistress to the throne, a divorce was necessary: but the method which he took to effect it did no honour either to his foresight or ingenuity. Modern controvertists would have taught him better. Had Messrs Le Mesurier and Granville Sharp been members of his council, they would have whispered the *Taxæ Cancellariæ Apostolicæ* in his ears: and by an application to the Roman chancery, he might have purchased at a small expense the indulgence which he desired (4). Or, could his pride have submitted to solicit the assistance of a theological rival, he might have applied to Luther; and I have no doubt the infallible apostle of the Reformation would as readily have gratified the King of England with two wives at the same time, as he did the Landgrave of Hesse (5). But, instead of these easy expedients, Henry determined to sue for a divorce in the court of Rome: and, strange as it must appear to every one, who knows that the Roman church is the mother of harlots, she, for some reason or other, hesitated to comply with his request. The passion of the king was irritated by delay; and he soon discovered the means of cutting at once the Gordian knot. He declared himself the supreme head of the church: the clergy yielded to his pretensions: and the two churches were separated. The consequence was natural. An obsequious primate pronounced the sentence of divorce, and the daughter of Sir Thomas Boleyn was substituted in the place of Catherine of Arragon. But, though the church of England was thus separated from that of Rome,

(4) If the reader wish to be acquainted with this pious fraud of former times, which duped not only the first disciples of the Reformation, but even some of its present advocates, he may consult the General Vindication of the Remarks on the Bishop of Durham's Charge, p. 65.

(5) See a short account of this edifying transaction in the same tract, p. 45.

no alteration, if we except the article of supremacy, was made in their respective creeds. The doctrine of the real presence was still professed by the English clergy: and it formed the first of the six articles, which Henry, in the plenitude of his ecclesiastical power, enacted to repress the temerity of religious innovators. It is fortunate for the Bishop of Durham, that he did not live, and publish his pamphlet, at that time. The first head of the church of England would have compelled him to recant at the door of St. Paul's, or have sent him to the stake in Smithfield. The grounds on which he attempts to justify the separation of the two churches, would have convicted him of heresy, even among those whom he professes to defend.

Perhaps it may be said, that the right reverend prelate alludes to the separation, which was effected, not in the reign of Henry, but under his daughter Elizabeth. Yet, even in this supposition, I contend that the title of the bishop's publication is inaccurate. The separation at that period was made, not on doctrinal, but on political grounds. The marriage of Henry with Ann Boleyn had been pronounced invalid by the Roman see: and Elizabeth, the fruit of that marriage, could not be a member of the catholic church, without virtually, at least, acknowledging her own illegitimacy, and resigning all claim to hereditary succession. A separation, therefore, from the Roman church, became expedient to her interests: and an act of parliament was procured, reannexing to the crown all that ecclesiastical pre-eminence and jurisdiction, which had been assumed by her father, and renounced by the late queen, her sister. A separation was thus effected: but that separation was, in its origin, merely political, and in its progress, and conclusion, was the act not of the clergy, but of a lay tribunal. It was opposed by all the bishops except one: by both universities, and by both houses of con-

vocation (6). But the spiritual was unequal to the temporal power. The principal of the clergy were deprived of their benefices: the church of England was dissolved: and a new church professing new doctrines, and governed by a new polity, was established in its place. That this church did not join in communion with the See of Rome, I willingly admit: but at the same time, I contend that it did not separate from it. They never were united, and of course could never be separated. For these reasons, I submit, that, whether the Bishop of Durham succeed or not in attempting to convict us of blasphemy, sacrilege, and idolatry, in our doctrine respecting the eucharist, he still cannot be justified in representing such doctrine as the ground of the separation of the church of England, from the church of Rome (7).

(6) Fuller, *Ecclesias. Hist.* l. ix. p. 54. 56.

(7) The illiberal use which the right reverend prelate makes of the word "Papist," and for which he offers some kind of apology, is beneath my notice. He may, if he please, consult on the subject, Dr. Milner's *Letters to a Prebendary*, p. 3. and *Constable on Catholic Emancipation*, p. 60.

REMARKS
ON THE
DOCTRINE OF THE BISHOP OF DURHAM,
WITH RESPECT TO
THE HOLY EUCHARIST.

ACCORDING to the catholic belief, the bread and wine in the sacrament of the eucharist, are made verily, and indeed the body and blood of Christ. This doctrine is grounded on the express words of our blessed Lord in the institution of the sacrament: *This is my body. This is my blood.* The natural import of these words, is so very obvious, that I shall content myself with only one observation; that if Christ had wished to inculcate the catholic doctrine, he could not have done it in terms better adapted to the purpose: and if he meant to inculcate the doctrine of the church of England, he could hardly have selected words more likely to lead his disciples into error.

In opposition to this statement, the Bishop of Durham contends, that the words of Christ are to be taken not in their literal, but in a figurative sense (8) now

(8) Lest the reader should ascribe to the right reverend prelate, the merit of this figurative discovery, I must inform him that it belongs to Zuinglius. The method by which that apostle came to the knowledge of it, is so very curious, that I shall

to me it appears, that the presumption is in favour of the literal meaning. If, as our adversaries maintain, it be from the scriptures, that each individual is to cull the articles of his creed, it is but reasonable to conceive, that the Holy Spirit will have delivered these articles in the sacred volumes, in terms the most natural and intelligible. To have described the more important points of Christian belief and Christian practice in figurative or metaphorical language, susceptible of a thousand different meanings, would have been to sow the seeds of disunion, and to perplex the mind of the sincere inquirer. We may therefore lay it down as a canon of scriptural interpretation,

transcribe the account from his own words in his book *De Subsidio Eucharistiæ*. After informing us that he had been disputing on the sacrament with little success, before the magistrates of Zurich, he proceeds thus. "Early in the morning of the thirteenth of April, (I speak the truth, though unwillingly. For I know how I shall be laughed at: but my conscience forces me) early in the morning, I seemed in my sleep to be disputing with much difficulty against my adversary: and to be struck dumb, so that I could not defend what I knew to be the truth—Then, most opportunely, a monitor seemed to be present (whether he were white or black, I do not remember, for I relate a dream) who exclaimed, why, you blockhead, answer what is written Exod. xii. It is the pasch, that is, the passover of the Lord. As soon as I had seen this phantasm, I awake, leap out of bed, examine the passage, and by means of it dispel every difficulty from the minds of my audience.

Visus est monitor adesse: (ater fuerit an albus, nihil memini: somnia enim narro:) qui diceret; Quin, ignave, respondeas ei quod Exod. xii. scribitur: est enim Phase, hoc est, transitus Domini, &c."

The colour of this supernatural teacher is still a problem. The bishop, probably, with Hospinian (*Hist. Sacram. par. 2. fol. 26.*) may think it a divine revelation: the infallible Luther is, however, of opinion, that it was an illusion of the devil; and therefore declares that Zuinglius and all who follow his doctrine, are insatanized, supersatanized, and persatanized; and have the devil infused, perfused, and transfused into them. (See the Tigurine Divines, *Contra Confessionem Lutheri*, tract iii p. 61.) However the doctrine of Zuinglius has been confirmed by act of parliament; and this must satisfy the conscience of every orthodox churchman.

that the literal should be considered as the true meaning, unless there be the clearest evidence of the contrary. The neglect of this canon, has opened a door to every species of religious innovation. It has enabled men to explain away all the mysteries of christianity; and even to justify a subscription to the truth of doctrines, which at the same time, they suspect, perhaps believe, to be false.

It should moreover be observed, that the doctrine which maintains the literal meaning of the words; *this is my body; this is my blood*, is not of recent invention, or confined to the breasts of a few individuals. It was the uniform belief of the whole Christian church at the time of the reformation. It had been the belief of the whole church for several centuries, according to the confession of our adversaries: according to our opinion, it had been so from the time of the apostles. At the present day, it is the belief of the great majority of Christians. It is believed by the church of Rome, and all the western churches in communion with her. It is believed by all the Lutheran churches, though they are separated from her. It is believed by all the oriental churches, whether they admit, or reject her communion. Now it cannot be from any partiality to the Roman church, that the Lutherans profess this doctrine. They are the first born of the reformation, the lineal descendants of the great patriarch, Luther. Neither can we suppose, that it has been adopted by the eastern churches, since their separation from those of the west. The jealousy, with which religious sects view each other, excludes such an idea. This doctrine then must have been universally adopted before the disunion of the western and eastern churches: and, as this disunion can in some instances, be traced back to the fifth century, it will follow, that the literal meaning has the testimony, of almost fifteen ages in its favour. Certainly an opinion of such antiquity, and such almost

universal diffusion in the Christian church, is deserving of respect, and should not be abandoned, but on the strongest grounds. We will therefore examine the grounds on which the Bishop of Durham builds his opposition to it.

“ Our Saviour said” (they are the words of the right reverend prelate.) “ This is my body which is broken for you. But at the institution of the sacrament his body was not broken ; and therefore the literal meaning could not have been the true meaning.” (9) This is the first of the “ conclusive arguments,” which the bishop’s pastoral solicitude has transmitted from the metropolis to the clergy of his diocese, for their instruction and edification. That they have received it with gratitude and admiration, I have no doubt. It is their duty to do so. But the profane eye of the catholic, will not be so easily satisfied. It will scrutinize the structure of this episcopal syllogism, and will soon discover its defects. Will the Bishop of Durham inform us, what other body besides his real body, Christ suffered to be broken for us. Was it not by the breaking of his real body, that our redemption was effected ? If then he gave the body that was broken for us, he gave his real, and not a figurative body. It is plain that the Greek participle, though in the present time, has a future signification ; so very plain, that the prelate himself, within the short space of six pages, forgetting his former objection, gives it that signification. “ The bread,” says he, which Christ brake, was an emblem of his body *to be broken* (10).

If my right reverend adversary be dissatisfied with this solution of his difficulty, he will allow me to propose to him an argument of similar form, and equally

(9) Grounds, p. 1.

(10) Ibid. &c. p. 8.

conclusive. When the angel announced to the Virgin the future birth of the Messiah, he said; “the holy thing, which is born of thee shall be called the son of God” (1). But at that time the Messiah was not born: therefore the literal meaning could not be the true meaning, and the angel spoke not of a réal, but a figurative Messiah. If the bishop venture to answer this argument, I have no doubt that he will, at the same time, answer his own objection against the catholic doctrine. I shall therefore beg permission on this head to refer him to himself.

The right reverend prelate proceeds to inform us, that by the ceremonial law, which was not yet abrogated, the jews were forbidden to eat blood; and thence infers that it is very improbable Christ should give his own blood to christians in the eucharist (2). If there be any person, to whom this argument appears “conclusive,” I do not envy him his powers of discernment: for my own part I should conceive I offered an insult to the judgment of my readers, were I seriously to attempt to refute it. *Tantum valeat, quantum valere potest.*

But, says the Bishop of Durham, “Christ was accustomed to speak of himself in figurative language” (3). He was so: and the great difference between his language on those occasions, and his language at the institution of the sacrament, forms in my mind, a strong argument that the latter was meant to be understood

(1) In the original, the participles in both passages are in the present time το γεννωμενον, Luke 1. 35. and κλωμενον, 1 Cor. ii. 24. To the former the English translators gave very properly a future signification; to the latter they gave very prudently a present signification. The future savoured too much of the errors of popery.

(2) Grounds, &c. p. 2.

(3) Ibid.

literally and not figuratively. I know that our adversaries are accustomed to appeal with confidence to the expressions, "I am the vine, I am the door, &c." but I have still to learn on what that confidence is founded. In these propositions the predicate is indefinite: it is not demonstratively fixed to any one particular object, as in the words: this is my body. We do not read that Christ ever laid his hand on a vine, and said, I am *this* vine, or took hold of a door, and said I am *this* door. Let the unprejudiced reader turn to the passages in question, and he will immediately see that they are allegorical. "He that entereth not by the door into the sheepfold, is a thief and a robber. But he that entereth in by the door, is the shepherd of the sheep—*I am the door*: by me, if any man enter in, he shall be saved." "*I am the vine*, and my father is the husbandman.—As the branch cannot bear fruit of itself, except it abide in the vine: no more can ye, except ye abide in me. *I am the vine*, ye are the branches." From the whole context it is evident that this is figurative language: but in the institution of the sacrament, there is not the remotest intimation that the words; "this is my body," are figurative language. In the former the sign is used for the thing signified; in the latter, if the literal be not the true meaning, the thing signified is used for the sign. The difference, therefore, between these passages, is so strikingly marked, that I think myself fully justified in drawing from that difference the conclusion, that the expression, "this is my body," was meant to be understood literally.

The right reverend prelate has, however, two other passages to produce, which he considers as exactly similar to the words, "this is my body," and which must, nevertheless, be understood in a figurative sense. The first is taken from St. Paul, "*And that rock was Christ*," not, "he adds literally Christ, but figura-

tively an emblem of Christ" (4). Now, I could wish to learn, what meaning the bishop assigns to the words immediately preceding; "Our fathers did all eat the same spiritual meat, and did all drink the same spiritual drink: for they drank of that spiritual rock that followed them." Was this spiritual meat, and this spiritual drink, of the same nature as that which the right reverend prelate recommends in his pamphlet to the notice of his protestant brethren? If it was, then they truly ate and drank Christ: the spiritual rock of which they drank was no emblem of Christ; it was Christ himself. Does he on the contrary, believe that the spiritual rock was in reality a material rock, and that the spiritual rock that followed the Israelites, was in reality a material rock that never moved from its place? Even this singular hypothesis can be of no service to its advocate. For the whole passage is evidently figurative. The apostle declares that he is speaking of figures, and of course we conclude that he is to be understood not literally, but figuratively. In the institution of the sacrament the case is very different. There we have no intimation of any figurative language, and consequently we are not prepared for it.

The other parallel expression adduced by the bishop, is that of our Lord, recorded by St. Luke. "This cup is the new testament in my blood." I am free to acknowledge that I do not perfectly understand his reasoning on it; but unless he prove, what I am sure he cannot prove, that its meaning is, this cup is the figure of the new testament in my blood, I do not see what assistance he can derive from it. It evidently has the same meaning as the words in St. Matthew and St. Luke: This is my blood of the new testament.

But it is principally on "the memorable discourse, which Christ addressed to the Jews at Capernaum, that the Bishop of Durham rests his cause." "He could almost persuade himself that an attentive and impartial comparison of it, with the institution of the sacrament, would induce the remarker and his friends to change their sentiments" (5). I fear, however, that the zeal of the prelate sometimes indulges in fallacious expectations. So far am I from being induced to change my sentiments by this discourse, that I conceive it (and in this I believe every catholic thinks with me) to afford the clearest demonstration of the truth of our doctrine. To it we constantly appeal, and I hope soon to convince the reader that it is not without reason that we do appeal to it. I will first transcribe the principal passages in that discourse, and then inquire which of the two, the catholic, or the protestant belief is the more consonant to them.

"I am the bread of life—the living bread, which came down from heaven.—If any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever, and the bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world. Except ye eat the flesh of the son of man and drink his blood, ye have no life in you. For my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed."

Now I must be allowed to maintain that, in the catholic system, this language is plain and intelligible, while in the protestant it is involved in so much obscurity, that no ingenuity can impart to it a rational meaning. If, as catholics teach, the words, "this is my body; this is my blood," are to be understood literally and not figuratively, if in the eucharist, the bread and wine become the real body and blood of Christ, then it is indeed true that we eat "the living bread which came down from heaven, even the flesh

which Christ gave for the life of the world:" then indeed, "we eat his flesh and drink his blood:" then with reason may it be said that "his flesh is meat indeed, and his blood is drink indeed." But if, as the church of England teaches, the words of the institution of the sacrament are not to be understood literally, if in the eucharist, the bread and wine are mere emblems of Christ's body and blood, then it cannot be true, that we eat the flesh which Christ gave for the life of the world; then we eat only the figure of his flesh, and drink only the figure of his blood: then his flesh is not meat indeed, nor his blood drink indeed; but meat is the emblem of his flesh, and drink is the emblem of his blood. And here I cannot but admire the presumptuous temerity of these men, who first maintain that the scriptures alone can be the ground of our faith, and that we are bound to believe whatever is clearly delivered in the scriptures; and then come forward and unblushingly propound as matters of faith, doctrines which not only are not consonant, but are even contradictory to the express declarations of the scriptures. Christ says, "this is my body," they say, it is not his body: Christ says, "my flesh is meat indeed, my blood is drink indeed," they say, his flesh is not meat indeed, nor his blood drink indeed; and because we refuse to believe them in preference to him, we are called unscriptural, we are ridiculed as ideots, we are condemned to the torments of hell as idolators (6). Nor is this all. Our scriptural adversaries can make us feel in our rights, as well as in our reputations: and because we will not swear that when Christ said, this is my body, he meant it was not his body, and will not subscribe to the truth of an opinion, which even the infallible Luther declares to have been first taught by the father of lies, we are denied the proudest distinctions, the best privileges of Englishmen.

Nothing, however, more forcibly demonstrates the truth of the catholic doctrines on this subject, than the difficulty, which figurative expositors experience in their endeavours to give any thing like a rational interpretation of the passages. "My flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed. Except ye eat the flesh of the son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you, &c." Of this, I wish for no better proof than what is furnished by the learned prelate himself. Within the short space of two pages, he has made five attempts to explain them, but he has found this land of figures a land of mist and darkness: at each step he has plunged deeper and deeper into the mire of uncertainty and inconsistency. Several of his explanations are what a logician would term, *obscurum per obscurius*. Let the reader judge.

1st Explanation.—"To eat Christ" (under this expression, the bishop comprises the meaning of all the passages transcribed before) "is to incorporate with the mind the spiritual food of faith and righteousness" (8). To *incorporate* with the *mind* the spiritual food of faith and righteousness! I trust it will not be thought disrespectful, if I decline making any comment on this explanation. To an orthodox intellect it may probably be sufficiently perspicuous: to mine it is an unknown tongue. It is a hard saying, and who can hear it?"

2d. Explanation.—"To eat Christ is to imbibe his doctrines, to digest his precepts, and to live by his example" (9). This explanation is meant, I presume, to detail the whole process of mental incorporation mentioned in the last, which we are now told consists in drinking one thing, digesting another, and living

(8) *Grounds*, p. 6.

(9) *Ibid*.

by a third; in drinking doctrines, digesting precepts, and living by example.

3d Explanation.—“We eat Christ by having him in our minds, and meditating on his life and sufferings” (1). This explanation possesses a merit, to which the two preceding explanations can make no claim. It can be understood. To me, however, it appears equally remote from the true meaning of our Saviour. To say of a man who reads a book with avidity, that he eats the book, is no violation of the propriety of language; and thus Ezechiel is recorded to have eaten the roll of prophecy. But to say of one who thinks on the sufferings of another, that he eats his flesh and drinks his blood, is a harsh, unnatural expression, which the utmost extravagance of oriental metaphor cannot justify. Though the right reverend prelate has referred me to Homer, as the best interpreter of the gospel, it is in vain that I have sought in Homer for a similar expression. His heroes may, indeed, gnaw their hearts, through grief and indignation: but I do not find that Achilles ever ate the flesh and drank the blood of Patrocles, or Priam that of Hector, though the former, thought frequently on the death of his friend, and the latter as frequently on the fall of his son.

4th Explanation.—“To eat Christ is to believe in him; and to eat his flesh is to keep up the remembrance of him, especially of his death” (2). Here the right reverend prelate appears to extend the limits of that indulgence which he granted in the preceding explanation. “To eat Christ is to believe in him.” It will not, I trust, be contended that to believe in Christ, and to meditate on his life and sufferings, are

(1) Grounds, p. 6.

(2) Ibid.

synonymous expressions. Thousands believe in him, who never meditate on his life and sufferings. These, however, we now learn, also eat him. Of course it must be conceded, that the preceding was but a partial and very inadequate explanation. A distinction, however, is drawn between eating Christ and eating his flesh: for the latter it is not only requisite to believe in him; we must moreover keep up the remembrance of him, especially of his death. What foundation there may be for this distinction, I know not.

5th Explanation.—“To eat the body of Christ, therefore, and to drink his blood at the sacrament, are figurative terms to denote an act of faith, by which we profess our faith in Christ, and commemorate his death, by eating the representative and vicarious elements of bread and wine” (3). Thus at length are we arrived at the important conclusion, which the right reverend prelate has been so long in search of. To eat the body and drink the blood of Christ, is to eat, not his body, but bread, as a representation and substitute for his body, and to drink, not his blood, but wine, as a representation and substitute for his blood. Now, I appeal to every dispassionate reader, whether the Jews at Capernaum were so much to blame for not understanding in this manner the words of our Saviour. Here we have seen a prelate of distinguished abilities and erudition toiling and writhing under the difficulty of the investigation; adopting four different explanations before he had the good fortune to light upon the true one; and afterwards so convinced of the obscurity of his labours, that he determines to write seven more pages in order to explain that explanation. How then can we expect that the Jews should have arrived at the same conclusion? They were a poor unlettered crowd: they possessed not the advantage of reading the Scriptures in their native tongue: they

could not acquire that theological acumen and biblical discernment, which the bishop informs us is only to be found in protestant universities (4). Though he blame them, I really think they were more deserving of pity than censure: and I conceive the majority of my readers, instead of condemning them, will wonder why our Saviour did not condescend to their ignorance, and tell them, that after all he was speaking figuratively, and only wished his disciples to visit a protestant church, and there eat a bit of bread, and drink a cup of wine. This would at once have done away every difficulty.

But is it then so very evident that the Jews did mistake the meaning of our Saviour on this occasion? That they understood him to speak of a real eating of his flesh, and of a real drinking of his blood, I acknowledge: and that the Bishop of Durham understands him to speak of a figurative eating, and a figurative drinking, I cannot deny. Their opinions are evidently contradictory: but I have been so much in the habit of disputing the statements of the right reverend prelate, that he will not, I trust, be disappointed, if I hesitate to prefer his authority before theirs. I have therefore considered the subject with no small degree of attention: and the more I have considered it, the more reason have I seen to believe, that the Jews were in the right. I do not mean to say, that they may not have formed erroneous conclusions in their own minds, as to the manner in which the manducation of our Saviour's body was to be effected; but in as much as they understood him to speak of a real eating and a real drinking, so far I contend that they understood his real meaning.

From the narrative of the evangelist, we learn that the audience of our blessed Lord, on this occasion, was

(4) Bishop of Durham's Charge, p. 10, 11. Quarto edition.

divided into two parties, of those who believed, and those who disbelieved, his mission. Now had these differed respecting the meaning of his discourse, there would have been, I confess, some ground for the bishop's opinion. But they were unanimous on this subject: both understood him to speak of a real eating of his body, and a real drinking of his blood. If the latter asked, "how can this man give us his flesh to eat?" the former exclaimed, "this is a hard saying, and who can hear it?" Many of them even abandoned him, and went over to his enemies. Hence we must adopt one of these two conclusions: either that our Lord did not speak of a figurative eating, or that he addressed his audience in a language, which neither his enemies nor his friends could understand.—Now the latter of these suppositions appears on the very face of it utterly improbable. He did, indeed, sometimes employ enigmatical language; but then it was on very different occasions. Here he was delivering instruction to those who sought it: he was explaining to them the most sacred and solemn ordinance in the religion, which he had undertaken to establish: and consequently he would employ such language as was most proper to convey his meaning, and would explain such passages as he had perceived to be misunderstood. Let us suppose that the Bishop of Durham had been present, and had heard the Jews ask, "how can this man give us his flesh to eat?" Would he not immediately have exclaimed, "you are under a mistake. He speaks not of a real, but of a figurative eating. Nothing can be more easy. To eat Christ, is to believe in him, to have him in your mind, and to meditate on him?" But did our Saviour answer in this manner? Did he tell them, that they misunderstood him, that he was speaking in a figurative sense? No. He endeavoured to confirm them in their opinion. He repeated his former assertion: he inculcated it in the strongest terms that language could furnish: he declared that their salvation de-

pended on their adhesion to it: and, to impress it the deeper in their minds, he confirmed it with the sanction of an oath. "Verily, verily, I say unto you, except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you—for my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed. He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me; and I in him. As the living Father has sent me, and I live by the Father, so he that eateth me, even he shall live by me." I appeal to every impartial reader, whether the manifest import of these words be not to confirm the Jews in the opinion of a real manducation, which they had previously conceived. Truly, if this were a mistake, the Bishop of Durham must, I think, confess, that Christ, the God of all truth, exerted all his power to lead his unsuspecting hearers into error.

The disciples of our Saviour appear to have listened to this discourse with extraordinary interest. Like his adversaries, they had understood him in the literal and not in a figurative sense: and like them they had been perplexed at the apparent impossibility of such a doctrine. When therefore the objection was proposed, "how can this man give us his flesh to eat?" they seem to have flattered themselves with the hope, that it would be explained in a sense less repugnant to their notions and feelings. They were disappointed; and expressed their disappointment by exclaiming, "this is a hard saying, and who can hear it?" Thus a new opportunity was offered our Saviour of undeceiving them, if his former words had been misunderstood. Yet what did he do? He permitted them to depart, and attributed their apostacy not to mistake, but to incredulity: "there are some of you that believe not." This observation alone appears to me to set the question at rest. That doctrine which they disbelieved was evidently the doctrine of really eating the body, and really drinking the blood, of Christ: now Christ certainly would not reproach them with the disbelief

of any other doctrine than that which he had taught ; therefore we may safely infer that the doctrine of Christ, respecting the eating of his body and the drinking of his blood, was to be understood in the literal and not in a figurative sense.

After the departure of the disciples, our Lord turned to the twelve apostles, and asked them, whether they also meant to leave him. Now what was their answer? Did they say, that they had not fallen into the same error with the others, but understood him to have spoken of a figurative eating, and a figurative drinking? On the contrary they appear to acknowledge that they had experienced the same difficulties, but had captivated their judgment unto the obedience of faith, They believe all that he has said, because they know him to be the Messiah. " Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life. And we believe and have known that thou art the Christ, the son of the living God." Thus the conduct of our Lord, the incredulity of the Jews, the apostacy of the disciples, and the faith of the apostles, all concur to prove that our Saviour spoke, on this occasion, of a real and not a figurative eating of his flesh, and of a real and not a figurative drinking of his blood.

But the Bishop of Durham has discovered a passage, which he persuades himself is a sufficient explanation of the meaning of our Saviour. After the disciples had expressed their surprise at his doctrine, he replied, " Does this offend you? What and if ye shall see the Son of man ascend up where he was before? It is the spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing: the words that I speak unto you are spirit and life." This passage, "It is the spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing," was, we are told, expressly meant to correct the misapplication of Christ's former words (5). Now, here also I must beg leave to dis-

(5) Grounds, p. 4.

sent from the right reverend prelate. To me the fact itself appears to demonstrate that this passage was not meant for any such purpose. Had Christ intended by it to remove the impression, which his former discourse had made on the minds of his disciples, it would infallibly have removed that impression. Had he designed by it to teach that he had spoken of a figurative eating and drinking, they would have understood him in that sense: and if they had so understood him, they would not have abandoned him. The very fact of their having abandoned him after these words shews that they did not consider them in the same light as the Bishop of Durham: for there certainly could be nothing in the figurative doctrine so shocking to the feelings or prejudices of the disciples, as to induce them to disbelieve a man, whom they had seen working the most stupendous miracles, and whom on the faith of those miracles they had followed as the promised Messiah. If then it be asked, what sense I affix to the passage in question, I would consider it as an illustration, and would paraphrase it in this manner. "As it is the spirit that quickeneth, and the body without the spirit is but a lifeless corpse, so the words which I have spoken to you are the spirit and life of the soul. Unless you believe them you are dead. And there are some among you, who believe not." This explanation appears to me the most natural comment on the words of our Saviour, and the most consonant to the narrative of the evangelist.

These observations will, I trust, convince most of my readers, that the catholic doctrine respecting the eucharist has some pretensions to the title of scriptural doctrine. Indeed I do not know that any article of the Christian faith is expressed in the sacred volumes in clearer and less exceptionable terms. I shall not, therefore, fatigue the reader by noticing and refuting the other objections of the right reverend prelate. None of them can lay claim to the merit of novelty.

They are as old as the Reformation : one of them is of still greater antiquity : it is as old as Christianity. It was the very objection of the Jews at Capernaum. When our Saviour promised us his flesh to eat, and his blood to drink, they thought it impossible, and exclaimed, "how can this man give us his flesh to eat?" In like manner, when we say that in the eucharist Christ gives us his flesh there really present to eat, and his blood there really present to drink, the Bishop of Durham declares it to be impossible, and calls out, how can Christ's body be both in heaven and on earth; how can it be eaten by many different persons at the same time? When he is perfectly acquainted with the limits of God's omnipotence, when he can clearly explain the relations which spirits bear to time and place, when he can shew us what that is which is the subject of the primary and secondary qualities in matter, then we shall listen with deference to his decisions on these questions: till then he may, if he think it more prudent, imitate the incredulity of the Jews and disciples at Capernaum: but he must permit us to follow the docility of the apostles: like them to subject our understanding to the words of Christ, and with Peter to say, "Lord, thou hast the words of eternal life: we believe and have known that thou art the Christ, the son of the living God."

But to have shewn that we had misunderstood the words of Christ, in the institution of the sacrament, was not enough to satisfy the orthodoxy of the Bishop of Durham. He proceeds to accuse us of idolatry; and, as if we were already condemned, pronounces us aliens from the kingdom of heaven. His zeal, however, is not without a precedent to justify it. We have before heard of men, "who could strain at a gnat, while they swallowed a camel:" and the right reverend prelate may in like manner be allowed to neglect the fashionable vices of the age, that he may the more efficaciously call down the vengeance of heaven on the imaginary

idolatry of the catholics. Than this, he appears to think, no offence can be committed less problematical in its nature, or more pernicious in its consequences. At the commencement of the present Session of Parliament, he saw the table of the House of Lords covered with bills of divorce, and he was silent: from a late investigation he became acquainted with those mysteries of iniquity which have roused the indignation of the country; and he still was silent: he daily sees instances of that moral and political corruption, which characterize the present times; and yet he still observes the most obstinate silence. Against the seducer, the adulterér, the peculator of the public money, he has no charges to preach, no pamphlets to publish, no memorials to present to his Majesty; all his curses are reserved for his catholic brethren. Them he pronounces guilty of sacrilege, blasphemy, and idolatry: them he represents as worthy of hatred here, and of endless torments hereafter (6). And for what purpose is all this? To rekindle the flame of religious animosity? To add to the discontent of five millions of his Majesty's subjects, who claim, and have hitherto claimed in vain, the common rights and privileges of their countrymen? Let him look at the condition of Europe. The Continent is at the feet of Bonaparte: and woe to this empire if it's inhabitants ever become a disunited people. "Every kingdom divided against itself is brought to desolation; and every city divided against itself shall not stand."

But let us inquire in what manner the bishop proves the justice of this charge. It is in a very summary way. "If," says he, "the papist worship the host as the image of God, or take that for a transubstantiated God, which (for reasons before given) is no God; in either case it is a violation of the second commandment, and is idolatry." It may, probably, be sufficient to reply in a similar style: if the catholics worship

as Christ, that which (for reasons before given) is Christ, it is no violation of the second commandment, and no idolatry. But, even were the bishop's supposition true, would the consequence necessarily follow? I must confess that I do not think so. If, conceiving that to be Christ, which in reality is not Christ, I worship it as Christ, I am guilty of a mistake, but I am not guilty of idolatry. My adoration is directed to Christ, and as such will be accepted by him. When Sysigambis fell at the feet of Hephæstion, whom she took for Alexander, was it an act of treason? Adoration is an act of the mind, and must be directed to some object apprehended by the mind. Consequently in the eucharist we do not adore bread and wine, for this plain reason, that we do not believe bread and wine to exist in it. We adore only Christ himself. The contrary notion is so preposterous, that I do not think it could find admission into any mind but that of an orthodox churchman. He is taught that in the sacrament he receives the body and blood of Christ, though at the same time he believes the body and blood of Christ not to exist in the sacrament: and such a man may perhaps persuade himself that the catholic adores bread and wine in the eucharist, though at the same time he believes neither bread nor wine to exist in the eucharist. To all others it will appear impossible.

As this accusation of idolatry is a new subject, I conceive it to have been introduced for the purpose of affording an opportunity to the right reverend prelate, of vindicating a most insulting passage in his original Charge: that our doctrine of the eucharist necessarily disposes the mind of the catholic to worship creatures for the Creator. In reply the remarker asked, what answer the Bishop of Durham would give to an unitarian, who, in like manner, should assert that the established doctrine of the divinity of Christ necessarily disposed the protestant mind to adore the creature

instead of the Creator? It is amusing to observe how reluctant the bishop and his advocates are to reply to this question: and with what anxiety they endeavour to evade it by instituting a parallel between the doctrines of the two churches. This, however, is only throwing dust into the eyes of their readers. I might easily object to the accuracy of their statements: but I do not wish to multiply the subjects of discussion. Whoever has observed how in the course of this controversy each reply and rejoinder has added to their number, will confess that it is more expedient to contract than to extend its limits. I shall therefore content myself with renewing the pledge which has been repeatedly given by the remarker: that if the bishop or his advocates will condescend to answer his question, he will shew that their answer will prove a satisfactory refutation of the bishop's insulting suggestion. Till they do this, the public will consider their silence as a confession that it is unfounded.

From idolatry, the bishop proceeds to the denial of the cup, a subject on which his orthodoxy prompts him to condemn us of sacrilege. With opprobrious terms I have no concern. Them I shall leave to the discretion of my right reverend opponent, and confine myself to the consideration of his arguments. On this subject, "the points at issue between us" (he must indulge me in the expression) are, first, whether there be any command that all Christians should communicate in both kinds; secondly, whether the participation of the cup be essential to the sacrament; and, thirdly, whether the practice of the primitive church prove the refusal of the cup to be a sacrilege.

1.—That there is such a command the Bishop of Durham attempts to shew by the following argument. "No one ever doubted that *take, eat*, is obligatory on the whole body of Christians, without any restriction of the bread to the apostles then present: and it

requires all the prejudice of education to find in the word *all* of the other command, “drink ye *all* of this,” a restraining power, which could imply the exclusion of all Christians who were not present from the participation of the cup” (7). Is this wit, or is it argument? Whatever it may be, we at least are not such idiots as to believe that the words, *drink ye all of this*, imply an “exclusion of all Christians, who were not present, from the cup.” Is there no medium between a command addressed to all Christians, and a prohibition addressed to all? If we do not allow the words to be a command, must it necessarily follow that we understand them as a prohibition?—But, if the right reverend prelate believe that “no one ever doubted of *take, eat*, being a command obligatory on the whole body of Christians,” he must allow me to inform him that he is in an error. The very fact itself proves that these words contain no such command. The apostles were sitting at table with our Saviour: he took bread, brake it into pieces, and distributed it among them, saying: take, eat, this is my body. What but the prejudice of education can discover in these words a command addressed to all succeeding generations? He then took the cup, and gave it to them to drink in succession, saying: “drink ye all of this.” And here, again, what but the prejudice of education can discover in these words a second command addressed in like manner to all generations? I do believe that every reader, whose mind is not predisposed by theological doctrines, will confess with me, that both expressions were no more than invitations addressed by Christ to his apostles, to eat his body and drink his blood in the sacrament, which he then instituted.

2.—Is the participation of the cup essential to the sacrament? The Bishop of Durham repeatedly asserts that it is: but by his own concessions sufficiently

proves that it is not. It certainly cannot be that the sacrament can remain, when that which is essential to its existence is removed. Since then my learned adversary allows, that, in the ancient church, it was on many occasions administered under one kind only, and since a greater authority than his, an act of parliament, permits, in certain cases, the same to be done in the present church of England, he must, I think, be content to agree with me, that the cup is not an essential part of the sacrament.

3.—The bishop appears to ground his doctrine principally on the practice of the ancient church. Now the question is not, whether, to communicate in both kinds were the more general practice of the ancient church, (that no catholic will deny): but whether such practice be so essential to Christianity that no human power could lawfully alter it. We maintain that it was not: and the lawfulness of the alteration has been demonstrated in the Remarks by several instances of the alteration of ancient practices, which by the laws of his church, and the customs of his own courts, the Bishop of Durham is compelled to approve. To this argument no answer has been attempted either by the bishop or by his advocates. I have therefore hitherto a right to consider it as unanswerable (8).

(8) In defending the practice of his church the vindicator had alluded to the words of the apostle, "whosoever shall eat this bread *or* drink this cup of the Lord unworthily," and had observed that the English translators had improved this passage by substituting the conjunctive particle *and* in the place of the disjunctive particle *or*. The Bishop of Durham replies: "We cannot be surprised that η and $\kappa\alpha\iota$ should be often used one for the other, when we recollect, that in the native language of the apostle the particle (*van*) was used in both senses." On this valuable specimen of biblical criticism, I may be indulged in a few remarks. First, though Hebrew scholars are accustomed to consider the conjunctive as having sometimes the force of the disjunctive particle, is it certain that their doctrine is ac-

Before I take my leave of this subject, I must notice some observations of the right reverend prelate, which regard the character of his opponents, more than the goodness of the cause which they have undertaken to defend. An inference, which the vindicator had drawn from the works of Pope Leo, has afforded the bishop an opportunity of charging that writer with disingenuousness, misrepresentation, and shameless sophistry. Reader, these are serious accusations; and, if they can be substantially proved, I must acknowledge, that the vindicator is deserving of thy hatred and contempt. But what would be thy sentiments, if the man, who thus accuses his adversary, were himself guilty of these crimes; if, while he displays this virtuous indignation against the imaginary misrepresentations of another, he were actually employed in attempting to deceive, by misrepresentation, the confidence of his readers? The vindicator had understood, and does still understand,

curate? In all the instances of the kind, which I have seen, it appears to me to be either a false reading, or to imply not a disjunction, but a repetition of some other words in the sentence. 2. What has this doctrine to do with the passage quoted from St. Paul? The apostle does not employ the conjunctive, but the disjunctive particle. Let then the Bishop of Durham shew, that, in the Hebrew language, the disjunctive has the force of the conjunctive particle, and his reasoning will apply. Till he has done this, he displays his erudition to little purpose. 3. I will allow him, that, by a Scriptural bull, the inspired writer might conceive, that, as *and* meant *or* in Hebrew, *or* might mean *and* in Greek: but, in return, I shall insist that it was equally probable, that he would use *and* for *or* in Greek, according to his vernacular idiom. If this be granted me, (and I see not how it can be reasonably denied,) I shall maintain that the passage, "as often as ye do eat this bread *and* drink this cup," should be rendered, "as often as ye do eat this bread, *or* drink this cup."—The truth is, when we thus take the liberty of altering the natural signification of words, we may make the Scripture speak just what we please.

"The text inspires not us, but we the text inspire."

DRYDEN.

the Pope to say, that the Manichees endeavoured to conceal themselves from public notice, by communicating with the Christians, and communicating, too, under one kind only. Hence it was inferred (I think justly) that many of the congregation, also, communicated in the same manner : otherwise, the very refusal to take the cup would have betrayed those, who sought thus to conceal themselves. Now, how does the bishop endeavour to refute this inference ? He pretends to transcribe the whole passage, not in the original language, (it did not suit his purpose,) but in an English translation : and in that translation carefully suppresses the very words, on which the vindicator's reasoning was grounded. The Pope says, "*Cum ad legendam infidelitatem suam nostris audeant interesse mysteriis, ita in sacramentorum communione se temperant ; ut interdum tutius lateant, ore indigno Christi corpus accipiunt, sanguinem autem redemptionis nostræ haurire omnino declinant*" (9). If you look for the important words, *ut tutius lateant*, that they may the more safely conceal themselves, you will not find them in the bishop's version. In their place, he has substituted, *to impose on the public*" (10), a phrase for which there is not the least authority in the language of the pontiff. And here allow me to ask the right reverend prelate, whether he consider the two phrases as being of exactly the same import ? If he do, what reason can he assign for rejecting that, which was more conformable to the original ? If he do not, how can he clear himself from the guilt of misrepresentation ?

But this is not the only instance, in which the Bishop of Durham has displayed his proficiency in the art of adulterating ancient testimony. He has favoured us with a version of a passage, attributed to Pope Gelasius :

(9) Sermon 4. De quadrag.

(10) Grounds, &c. p. 23.

and has executed this version with as much fidelity as that from Pope Leo. It is as follows: "We find that some persons, through I know not what superstition, after partaking of the bread, refuse the cup, who, without doubt, ought to receive both kinds, or to abstain from both" (1). Now the real words of the pontiff are: "We find that some persons, after partaking of the *sacred body*, abstain from the cup of the *sacred blood*, who (*because* they are said to be influenced by I know not what superstition) should, undoubtedly, receive both kinds, or be *excluded* from both kinds. *Comperimus, quod quidam, sumpta tantummodo corporis sacri portione a calice sacri cruoris absterneant. Qui proculdubio (quoniam nescio qua superstitione docentur obstringi) aut integra sacramenta percipiant, aut ab integris asceantur* (2). Now, besides the other infidelities in the bishop's version, why, I ask, was the passage within the parenthesis removed from its place, and the word *because* omitted. I fear for this reason, that, as it stood in the original, it entirely refuted the inference which the bishop wished to draw from it. It shewed that the reason why they were to be compelled to receive both kinds was, because they refused the cup through superstition, and at the same time intimates, that, had it not been for that superstition, they would not have been molested. If the reader ask, what their superstition was, I answer, supposing the decree to be genuine (3), and the persons alluded to Manichees, that it consisted in believing wine to be the

(1) Grounds, &c. p. 24.

(2) Decret. 3. part. dist. 11. c. 12.

(3) The bishop asks what reason there is to doubt its authenticity. I answer, several. 1. The letter, from which it professes to be taken, is not to be found in any collection of the letters of Gelasius. 2. The passage itself appears to have no connexion whatever with the remainder of the letter, which occurs, can. 25. q. 2. c. 25. 3. It is not noticed by any writer who lived before the twelfth century.

creature of the evil spirit, and of course incapable of being consecrated and forbidden to be drank. Whence the Pope proceeds to condemn them of a great sacrilege, by dividing one and the same mystery. *Quia divisio unius ejusdemque mysterii sine grandi sacrilegio non potest provenire.*

There is another subject, on which, if we may believe the Bishop of Durham, the vindicator has been guilty of "a misrepresentation, as disingenuous and perverse as his abuse of Leo's testimony." A statute of Edward VI. c. 1. which enjoins the reception of the sacrament in both kinds, except in cases of necessity, where it is impossible for the communicant to receive more than one, is alleged by him as a justification of the popish denial of the cup to those who are able to receive both.—The vindicator is endeavouring to justify the popish denial of the cup to the laity: but the permission of the eucharist in one kind only, in cases of necessity, gives no countenance "to the entire suppression of one kind" (4). It is with considerable reluctance that I here again find myself compelled to retort the charge in the teeth of the right reverend accuser. To convict his adversary, he commits the very crime of which he accuses him: to support the charge of misrepresentation, he has recourse to misrepresentation himself. He suppresses the inference, which the vindicator drew from the statute of Edward VI. and in its place substitutes an inference, which the vindicator did not draw. That writer did not allege the lawfulness of receiving under one kind, in cases of necessity, as a justification of the denial of the cup, when there was no necessity; nor did he argue that the permission of one kind, on such occasions, proved the lawfulness of the entire suppression of one kind. This reasoning exists nowhere but in the ima-

gination of the Bishop of Durham. The immediate point in discussion was, whether the cup were an essential part of the sacrament: and the vindicator contended, that, since it might be lawfully suppressed, without injury to the sacrament, it was not an essential part. Take his words. "In the first of Edward VI. c. 1. it was enacted, that the most blessed sacrament be hereafter *commonly* delivered, and ministered, unto the people under both kinds, that is to say, of bread and wine, except necessity otherwise require. Hence it will follow, that the English church did not originally conceive the wine to be an essential part of the sacrament. For, those who say that one kind should not be administered commonly, grant that it may be done sometimes: and by specifying the case of necessity, acknowledge the propriety of the doctrine, that teaches only one kind to be essential to the sacrament." If thus to pervert the reasoning of an adversary, and, on such perversion, to accuse him of misrepresentation, be not the most disingenuous kind of misrepresentation that can exist, I have yet to learn what misrepresentation means (5).

The bishop informs us, that the statute of Edward VI. is still in force. May I then recommend it to his notice? Perhaps, from the moderation with which it is worded, he may learn to condemn the intemperance of his own language. Do its authors say, that to com-

(5) This answer, I trust, will satisfy the authors of the *British Critic*. It was certainly grateful in them to praise the labours of their patron, but it was impolitic to do it in so unguarded a manner as to betray their ignorance of the work of the writer, whose disgrace they are so eager to record—With equal precipitance, in their review of Stephenson's *Romish Church*, they wonder what reply Mr. Des Mahis can make to his victorious opponent. Had they ever opened the work, of which they pretend to judge, they would have known that he could make no reply. It is more than a century since he was laid in the grave!

municate under one kind, is "a sacrilege, and violation of the divine command?" No, but that to communicate under both kinds is "more agreeable to the first institution of the sacrament, and more conformable to the practice of the apostles, and of the primitive church." Do they pronounce those, who follow the opposite opinion, to be "mutilators of the sacrament, and derogators from the mediatorship of God the Son?" No: they expressly declare that it is not their intention to condemn the usage of any other church. They were not such inconsequent reasoners, as to teach that the eucharist might be sometimes given under one kind, and, at the same time, to affirm that those who did give it under one kind were guilty of sacrilege, mutilated the sacrament, and violated the command of Christ. Such language as this was reserved for more modern controvertists.

But, if I mistake not, that which has kindled the flame of indignation in the breast of the right reverend prelate, is the following passage in the vindicator's Letter to the Durham Clergyman. "That, in theory, the faith which you profess, is founded on Scripture, may, or may not, be true: that in practice it is founded on the authority of Parliament, will not be denied. Acts of Parliament alone can make articles of faith: and Acts of Parliament alone can declare any doctrine heretical. Whether, or not, the church of Christ be of this world, it is evident the church of England is (6)." "In this short passage," observes the Bishop of Durham, "there are three falsehoods." I suspect they are three truisms. "It is false to say Acts of Parliament make articles of faith. Parliament declares them, but does not make them." The distinction is ingenious. There is certainly a difference in the sound, if there be none in the meaning of the words. Parlia-

ment is not infallible: it is therefore possible, that it may declare an article of faith, which is not founded in Scripture: and in this case, would not the declaration amount to the making of an article of faith? Let me ask, whether there be any tribunal in the world besides the "high court of Parliament," that can add to, or take from, the thirty-nine articles of the church of England? And if Parliament were to strike out a certain number of these articles, or to "declare" a certain number of additional ones, would not every orthodox clergyman, whether that reduction or augmentation were, or were not, according to Scripture, be compelled to subscribe to the altered copy? I appeal then to every man of common sense, whether it be not true to say, that Acts of Parliament alone can make articles of faith, and that, in practice, the faith of the established church is founded on the authority of Parliament. The bishop proceeds to boast "that the church of England is no otherwise of this world, than prophecy declared the church of Christ should be, in predicting that kings should be her nursing fathers, and queens her nursing mothers." Had the prophet, however, foreseen the result of a late investigation, he would have known that other princes, besides kings, have been nursing fathers, and other ladies, besides queens, have been nursing mothers, to the church.

Among the predecessors of the Bishop of Durham was a Doctor Howson, as ambitious of gaining laurels in the field of controversy as the present right reverend prelate, and as unsuccessful in his attempts. Confident in his own abilities, this theological pedant is recorded to have declared, that "he would loosen the Pope from his chair, though he were fastened thereto with a tenpenny nail (7)." In defiance, how-

(7) Hutchinson's Durham, Vol. 1. p. 494.

ever, of Doctor Howson's loosening powers, the Pope remained seated in his chair: and in like manner, I trust, that, notwithstanding Doctor Barrington's "conclusive arguments," catholics will continue to profess the belief of their fathers in the real presence; and to those, who seek to satisfy them with figurative explanations, will reply, with the poet—

Why all this frantic pain
To construe what his clearest words contain,
And make a riddle what he made so plain?

REMARKS
ON THE
BISHOP OF DURHAM'S EXPLANATION
OF
THE ANTEPENULTIMATE ANSWER
IN THE
CHURCH CATECHISM.

THE last subject which the right reverend prelate discusses, and that for which the whole pamphlet appears to have been written, is an attempt to explain in a rational manner the established doctrine respecting the Lord's supper. In the prosecution of this plan, he does not spare the character or feelings of his adversary. He condemns him of blasphemous levity, pronounces him unworthy of religious toleration, and reminds him of the laws enacted against those who attempt to malign the doctrines and ordinances of the established church (1). There was a time when the Bishop of Durham deprecated "the revival of impassioned controversy:" but his prudence has at last been subdued by his zeal; and his present conduct, joined to his promise of many more publications of a similar tendency, call to my recollection those lines of the poet:—

Furor iraque mentem
Præcipitant, pulchrumque mori succurrit in armis.

(1) *Grounds*, p. 37. 44.

Allow me, however, to ask what sufficient cause I have given for this angry language, these opprobrious insinuations, these threats of vengeance? Had I forged a false creed for my unoffending neighbours, and, on the strength of this forgery, had held them out to the derision and hatred of the public; or had I, at a moment when the very existence of the nation was at stake, attempted by misrepresentation to divide it against itself, and arm five millions of British subjects against the established church; then indeed I might think myself deserving of the vengeance of the laws, and unworthy of toleration in civilized society. But I have done none of these things. I have only repelled a most illiberal and unprovoked aggression; and have taught the aggressor to feel that he is not himself invulnerable. In the Remarks, I gave him a gentle hint, that his language might easily be retorted on himself. But that hint was despised: and his advocates, with all the pride of conscious superiority, rushed forward to trample into dust the man who had presumed to question the accuracy or the judgment of the Bishop of Durham. They met, however, with a resistance they were not taught to expect; and now, unable to overcome him in argument, they vent their disappointment in threats and insults. Yet, what is in reality the crime of which I am accused? of saying that the established doctrine respecting the Lord's supper appeared to me a paradox, and something like nonsense. "This is the head and front of my offending." Let the reader compare this with the bishop's charges against us, of blasphemy, sacrilege, and idolatry, of patronizing ignorance, encouraging vice, and adulterating the scriptures, of derogating from the honour of God the Father, from the mediatorship of God the Son, and from the sanctifying influences of the Holy Spirit, and, instead of condemning me of intemperance, he will, I trust, praise my moderation: instead of thinking that I have transgressed the bounds of decorum,

he will thank me for chastising that temerity, which, because the thirty-nine articles have been confirmed by Act of Parliament, arrogates to itself the privilege of defaming and calumniating every other church.

The Bishop of Durham begins this part of his pamphlet by observing, that the difficulty which the remarker finds in conceiving the established doctrine respecting the eucharist, originates in the *duplicity* of that writer. Without returning the compliment, I shall inquire in what manner that doctrine has been explained by the bishop and his advocates. If their explanations prove discordant, I shall infer that it is not so very easy to understand; if the very teachers of Israel cannot agree respecting its meaning, I trust it cannot be a very great crime if others do not perfectly comprehend it.

The first of these expositors (the first, if not in reputation, at least in time) was Elijah Index, of facetious memory, who, with his accustomed *naïveté*, acknowledged that the eucharist is nothing more than a *plain, simple, commemorative rite*; that the words of the catechism are at first sight repugnant to the real doctrine of the church of England; and that the faithful communicant receives verily and indeed, not the body and blood of Christ, but the benefit of the sacrament (2). How far this answer was admired by his diocesan, I know not: but the next writer, who made the attempt, and whose labours were honoured with that prelate's approbation, offered to the public a different exposition. He contended that the answer in the catechism was accurate: that to eat the body and to drink the blood of Christ, is to partake of the blessings which his body broken and his blood shed have purchased for us: and that the hallowed elements are an instrumental cause, by which actual possession

(2) Protestants' Reply, p. 14. Reply to the Review, p. 21.

is given of all the graces which his sacrificed body can yield: that they are to us his body and blood (3). This interpretation was permitted to assume the honours of orthodox doctrine during the long period of ten months: at the expiration of that term a new discovery was made; and the same writer assured us, that to receive the body and blood of Christ was no longer "to receive the graces which his sacrificed body can yield," but to be put in possession of the title to that inheritance, which Christ purchased for us with his blood (4). To this decision also I bowed with becoming respect, under the persuasion that the obligation of assenting to it would not be of very long continuance. Nor have I been disappointed. The right reverend prelate, sensible of the errors of his advocates, has taken his cause into his own hands, and has transmitted to his clergy a letter of instruction on this very important subject. To this letter I request the reader's attention, trusting that it has set the question at rest, and that for the future the orthodox mind will no more "be tossed to and fro, and carried about with so many winds of doctrine."

1. The bishop informs us that the church of England "acknowledges the spiritual presence of Jesus Christ," that "the faithful receive spiritually *at* the sacrament that which exists there spiritually," and therefore "that the body and blood of Christ are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful *in* the Lord's supper" (5). If these words have any meaning, they must mean that the body and blood of Christ are really though spiritually present *at* or *in* the Lord's supper; are really taken and received by each faithful communicant. Here then we seem to

(3) Letter by a Clergyman of the Diocese of Durham, p. 23, 24.

(4) Clergyman's Second Letter, p. 41.

(5) Grounds, p. 39.

have a real presence: but let us not be too precipitate in our conclusions.

2. The learned prelate proceeds to teach us that "to eat the *body* of Christ is an act of the *mind*: that Christ is our spiritual food, and faith the faculty by which we eat that food, and therefore that to eat Christ is to believe in him (6)." Here the right reverend prelate appears to me to pull down with one hand what he had built with the other. "To eat Christ is to believe in him." Of course the only presence which he allows is a mental, not a real, presence. Christ is present to the mind only inasmuch as he is the object of the mind's belief. But in this case what is there to distinguish the sacrament from any other religious ceremony? In any of them Christ may be the object of the belief of the mind. The Christian, who with a true faith repeats the apostles' creed, as certainly professes his belief, as he who receives the sacrament. Yet who ever conceived, that, in the recital of the creed, the true body and blood of Christ are verily and indeed taken and received? This doctrine, if it be properly examined, reduces the real presence of Christ to a real absence. According to it, Christ is no more really present to the communicant, than the Emperor of China is really present to me, when I think on him.

"To think and believe," says the Bishop of Durham, are as really acts of the mind, as to eat is an act of the body. What is done by the mind is as truly done as what is done by the body. The body of Christ is therefore as truly, as verily, and indeed received by faith, as the bread is by the mouth (7)." This is most singular language. I certainly distrust my own judgment, as I cannot boast, like the right

(6) Grounds, p. 39.

(7) Grounds, p. 40.

reverend prelate, of having studied in a reformed university (8) : but if the prejudices of education do not strangely deceive me, this doctrine is pregnant with the most paradoxical consequences. Whatever is the object of the operations of the mind, is, it seems, eaten by the mind, is as truly, as verily, and indeed taken and received by such operations, as corporeal food is by the body. Thus if you meditate on heaven and the joys of the blessed, you eat heaven and the joys of the blessed, you take and receive them verily and indeed. If you meditate on hell and its inhabitants, you eat hell and its inhabitants; you take and receive them verily and indeed. What a capacious stomach an orthodox mind must have (9) !

(8) Bishop of Durham's Charge, p. 11.

(9) In a note the learned prelate directs us to two very ancient teachers, for the true meaning of the words, to eat the body and drink the blood of Christ (p. 44). Perhaps the anticipation of the reader has already led him to those who are frequently styled the fathers of the church, to a Chrysostom, a Cyril, an Ambrose, &c. No : the bishop's doctors are of still greater antiquity : they lived before Christianity was preached; they are Cicero and Homer. "We feed on the object of our devotion," (i. e. eat the body of Christ) "as Calchas, in the anxiety of his heart, fed on his own thoughts; *ipse suum cor edens*, as Cicero translates the words of Homer." Now this passage, which should be so precious in the estimation of every orthodox churchman, deserved I think more honourable mention. It should have been transcribed, or referred to. At least, through compassion to the ignorance of his readers, the bishop should not have furnished them with a deceitful clue, by attributing this discovery in the art of feeding to Calchas, when it is due to Bellerophon. I will transcribe both the original, and Cicero's translation. Bellerophon, perceiving himself an object of hatred to all the gods, retired into solitude, where he consumed his soul in grief :—

Ητοι ο καππεδιον το Αλθιον οιος αλατο,
Ον θυμον κατεδων, πατον ανθρωπων αλειωνων.

Ιλιαδ, Z. 201.

Which Cicero thus translates :—

Qui miser in campis mœrens errabat Aleis,
Ipsè suum cor edens, hominum vestigia vitans.

Tusc. quæ. l. iii.

Now

According to the dietetic language of the bishop's theology, to believe in Christ, and to eat the body of Christ, are two synonymous expressions. They denote one and the same thing. Of course, since acts of faith can be exercised any where and at any time, Christ's body may be eaten any where and at any time: and this consequence the right reverend prelate candidly admits. Moreover it will follow, that Christ's body will be eaten by every "considerate" believer, as often as he repeats the creed, and the same benefits will be derived to the soul from the repetition of the creed, as from the sacrament. For, if we may believe the catechism, the benefit derived from the sacrament is the strengthening and refreshing of our souls by the body and blood of Christ; and, since the same body and blood are really received by the recital of the creed, I presume the soul will receive from it equal strength and nourishment. Indeed it appears to me that the creed may claim the superiority over the sacrament. The latter can only be administered on certain occasions: it requires the assistance of a Clergyman, and the presence of another communicant. But by reciting the creed you may eat the body of Christ by yourself, whenever you please, and without any obligation to others. The Bishop of Durham has indeed endeavoured to point out one circumstance, in which he thinks the sacrament possesses an advantage over the creed: and this

Now I think this a very unfortunate illustration; for, first, the man, who feeds on the anxiety of his own heart, has, at the best, but a very sorry meal of it; and, secondly, the bishop contends, that to eat Christ is to believe in him, to meditate on him. But do the words of Homer or of Cicero mean that Bellerophon believed in his soul or heart, or that he meditated on it? Truly, this is one of the *difficiles nugæ* of orthodoxy, and only serves to shew that the time is come described by the poet,

When churchmen scripture for the classics quit—
Polite apostates from God's grace to wit.

depends on the theory of the association of ideas. "The act of eating bread," he says, "and drinking wine, in obedience to a command of Christ, and in remembrance of his death, easily associates itself in the mind with another act of obedience to Christ, that is, eating the flesh of Christ as the bread of life, and drinking his blood, without which we have no life in us." I think, however, that all this is still more effectually performed in the repetition of the creed : for we cannot repeat it with attention without exercising an act of belief in Christ, and recalling to our minds his passion and death.

St. Paul assures us that the unworthy communicant "eats and drinks damnation to himself, not discerning the Lord's body, that he is guilty of the body and blood of the Lord." These are strong expressions, and evidently imply a profanation of the body and blood of Christ. But the doctrine of the Bishop of Durham leaves nothing for the unworthy communicant to profane. According to him, the unworthy communicant is an unbeliever who cannot, or an inconsiderate Christian who does not, exercise an act of faith. To these, since it is faith which constitutes the presence of the body and blood of Christ, that body and blood are not present. As they cannot receive them, so they cannot profane them. They cannot be guilty of that body and blood, which to them has no existence (1).

(1) The bishop censures the vindicator for having observed, that, according to his system, St. Paul should have said unworthy communicants were deprived, instead of guilty, of the body and blood of Christ. "They cannot," he says, "be deprived of what they have not. They are without God and Christ, for they are not in all their thoughts." It makes little difference in the force of the vindicator's argument. I do not, however, think it a very heinous offence against the propriety of language, to say of a man, who through his own fault neglects to acquire some great advantage, an estate, for example, that he has deprived himself of the estate: but I do think it would be, to say that he was guilty of the estate.

But are there no unworthy communicants besides the unbeliever and the inconsiderate Christian? The right reverend prelate has often told us that to eat the body of Christ is “to digest his precepts.” Now it is well known that to many Christians these precepts are rather difficult of digestion: and I think it possible that some communicants may be very seriously troubled with this spiritual dyspepsia. Let us suppose such a one, that he may qualify himself for office, or for any other reason, to receive the sacrament: let us suppose him, while he receives it, to exercise an act of faith, which is certainly possible, and which will take him out of the class of unbelievers, and that of inconsiderate Christians. Now, I ask, does this man receive worthily or unworthily? If worthily, then to digest the precepts of Christ is not a necessary requisite, which contradicts the doctrine of the Bishop of Durham. If unworthily, then the unworthy communicant, who exercises an act of faith, must eat the body of Christ, which is contrary to the doctrine of the church of England.

The true source of all these difficulties and inconsistencies is to be found in the established creed itself. That creed teaches that the true body of our Saviour is really present in the sacrament, though that real presence amounts, in truth, to a real absence. This, if it be not sound sense, was at least sound policy. Its original framers knew that the Christian world was divided into two parties: the one consisting of the catholics and Lutherans, who contended for the real presence of Christ’s body, though they differed as to the manner of that presence; the other of the Zuinglians and Calvinists, who rejected the real presence, and admitted nothing more than a bare figure and memorial of the death of Christ. By appearing to admit both opinions into different parts of the articles, catechism, and rubrics, they opened a door for proselytes from either party, who might thus be-

come orthodox churchmen, and still retain their favourite opinions. Thus the original articles published by the authority of Edward VI. contained a long paragraph against the "real and bodily presence," as they term it: which paragraph, though it was subscribed by both houses of convocation in the reign of Elizabeth, was omitted by the command of that female head of the church. "The design of government," says Burnet, "was at that time much turned to the drawing over the body of the nation to the Reformation, in whom the old leaven had gone deep; and no part of it deeper than the belief of the corporeal presence of Christ in the sacrament: therefore it was thought not expedient to offend them by so particular a definition in this matter, in which the very word, real presence, was rejected (2)." In like manner, in the second Book of Common Prayer, published by Edward VI. was inserted a long rubric, rejecting "all adoration unto any real and essential presence of Christ's natural flesh and blood." This also was laid aside by order of Elizabeth. "It being the queen's design," says Wheatly, "(as I have already observed more than once) to unite the nation as much as she could, in one faith, it was therefore recommended to the divines to see there should be no definition made against the aforesaid notion, but that it should remain as a speculative opinion not determined, but in which every one might be left to the freedom of his own mind (3)." King James imitated the caution of his predecessor; and when he commissioned Bishop Overal, then Dean of St. Paul's, to add to the catechism the explanation of the

(2) Burnet, Exposition of the XXXIX Articles, p. 308.

(3) Wheatly, Illustration of the Book of Common Prayer, p. 334. That which it was then lawful for every one to do according to his own judgment, is now by the Bishop of Durham declared to be idolatry. The rubric was reinserted in 1661, with this alteration, that *corporeal* presence was substituted for *real* and *essential* presence.

sacraments, was careful that the real presence should be taught in such manner as might satisfy the patrons of that doctrine. Let us examine the words of the catechism.

In it we are told that "the inward part of the sacrament, or the thing signified, is the body and blood of Christ:" by which is meant the real body that was broken and the real blood that was shed for us, according to the Bishop of Durham. We are next told that "this same body and blood," the thing signified, "are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's supper." But how can this be, if they be not there? The words *taken* and *received* evidently allude to the actions of taking the bread and the cup into the hands, and of receiving them by the mouth. If then, when you take the bread into your hands, you take the real body of Christ, and when you take the cup into your hands you take the real blood of Christ, does it not follow that the real body and blood of Christ must be there? Such, at least, is the obvious meaning of the words; and if it be the obvious it must be the true meaning. For the catechism was not written to be the subject of logical and grammatical disquisitions. It was intended for the instruction of children and the unlearned: its language must of course be supposed easy and perspicuous: and the meaning which naturally presents itself to the reader must be considered as the meaning originally intended by him who composed, and those who authorized it. In any other supposition you convict both, of duplicity or folly.

I shall, perhaps, be told that these and similar passages should be explained by the twenty-eighth article, which clearly shews in what sense the church of England understands the real presence. I think, however, that from the cautious manner in which that article is worded, an argument may be deduced in favour of the catholic doctrine. The words are, "the

body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten in the supper, only after a heavenly and spiritual manner; and the mean whereby the body of Christ is received and eaten is faith." Be it so. Catholics say as much. But does this heavenly and spiritual manner prevent it from being the real body that was broken, and the real blood that was shed for us? If so, that which is taken and received in the sacrament may be the influence of Christ's body and blood, the graces which he has purchased for us, the title to a heavenly inheritance, or any thing else that it may please the ingenuity of our adversaries to suggest: but it certainly is not the inward part or thing signified, which, according to the catechism, is the real body and the real blood of Christ. But if, on the contrary, this spiritual manner does not exclude the reality of the body and blood of Christ, then my former argument remains in all its force. And here I may observe, that the article says more than the catechism. It says that the body of Christ is given, as well as taken and eaten, in the Lord's supper. As the action of giving is prior to that of taking and eating, the body of Christ must exist in the sacrament before it is taken and eaten by the communicant. "The mean by which it is taken and eaten is faith." But by what mean is it given? On this head the article is silent: and, I think, with some reason. For it cannot be given by faith. To exercise an act of faith "is to eat Christ;" and undoubtedly to eat, and to give to another to eat, are two very different things.

The same doctrine, of really *giving* in the sacrament the body and blood of Christ to the faithful, I find in Dean Nowell's Catechism for Schools, first published in 1570. *Corpus et sanguis Christi fidelibus in cœna domini præbentur, ab illisque accipiuntur, comeduntur, et bibuntur, celesti tantum et spirituali modo verè tamen atque reipsa* (4). So that, when it

was asserted, by a catholic controvertist, that, according to the established doctrine, the bread of the supper is but a figure of Christ, Bishop Montague had some reason to answer, "Is but a sign or figure, and no more? Strange! And yet our formal words are, *This is my body: this is my blood. This is* is more than this figureth, or designeth. A bare figure is but a phantasm. He gave *substance* and *really subsisting essence*, who said, this is my body: this is my blood (5)." I know that both this divine and others, who have held a similar language, have on other occasions taught the contrary doctrine: but this corroborates my assertion, since it shews that, in endeavouring to defend the tenets of the established creed, they were compelled first to acknowledge a real presence, and then to explain it away, till it meant a real absence.

As Archbishop Wake is one of the infallible doctors, from whose decision the right reverend prelate will not allow catholics to appeal, I have been curious to learn what were his sentiments on this important subject. In his catechism, entitled *The Principles of the Christian Religion explained*, he asks this question: Are the body and blood of Christ really distributed to every communicant in this sacrament? The answer is in the negative. "No, they are not. For then every communicant, whether prepared or not, would alike receive Christ's body and blood there." But, allow me to ask, is not this doctrine contradictory to the article? The article says, the body of Christ is given: the catechism, that it is not given. Nor let it be said, that the article speaks of the faithful only, while the catechism speaks of every communicant. For the rest of the answer shews that it refers to every communicant distributively, and includes the faithful as well as the unfaithful. "That which is given by the priest to the communicant is, as to its nature, the

same after the consecration that it was before, viz. bread and wine; only altered as to its *use* and signification." The next question is one which very naturally occurs. "If the body and blood of Christ be not really given, and distinguished by the priest, how can they be verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful communicant?" Before I transcribe the answer, I must observe, this question proves, that according to the archbishop, and in opposition to the article, the body of Christ is not given even to the faithful communicant. The following is his answer: "That which is given by the priest is, as to its substance, bread and wine: as to its sacramental nature and signification, it is the figure, or representation, of Christ's body and blood, which was broken and shed for us. The very body and blood of Christ *as yet it is not*. But being with faith and piety received by the communicant, it becomes to him, by the blessing of God, and the grace of the Holy Spirit *the very body and blood of Christ*." Here at last we have undoubtedly a real presence. The figure or representation of Christ's body and blood, which, as yet, was not the very body and blood of Christ, at last becomes his very body and blood. Is not this at least a change of the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ? Reader, be not so easily imposed upon. The whole is nothing more than a theological phantasmagoria. Ask the archbishop how the bread and wine becomes to the faithful and worthy communicant the very body and blood of Christ, and he will answer you: "As it entitles him to a part in the sacrifice of his death, and to the benefits thereby procured to all his faithful and obedient servants." Thus, in the short space of three lines, the very body and blood of Christ vanish away, and leave in their place a mere title to spiritual benefits. Thus do we learn, that, after all that the primate had said about the very body and blood of Christ, he meant no such thing as the body and blood of Christ, but only a right to a part in the sacrifice of his death!

It may, perhaps, have been owing to the prejudices of a popish education, but it was a long time before I could form a distinct notion of the meaning attached by orthodox writers to this expression: "a real presence of the body and blood of Christ after a spiritual manner." My ignorance was at last dispelled by the luminous distinction of Bishop Taylor between the signification of the word spiritual in orthodox, and its signification in popish language. "By spiritually present, the papists mean present after the manner of a spirit: we mean, present to our spirits only (6). But what kind of a real presence is that, which is neither after the manner of a body, nor after the manner of a spirit? According to this doctrine, Christ's body and blood are no otherwise present in the eucharist, than the invisible lady was present in the chest: that is, they are present to the apprehension of the communicant, but in reality absent.

Such, reader, are some of the reasons which induced me to make the assertion that has given so much offence to the Bishop of Durham; and when thou considerest, that the obvious meaning of the doctrine, which I have ventured to oppose, is contradictory to itself; that, of its expositors, scarcely two can agree in the same interpretation; and that, however zealous they may at first appear in the defence of a real presence, they always end by maintaining a real absence, I trust thou wilt conclude, that my opinion was not rashly and precipitately formed.

In conclusion, should aught occur in the preceding pages, that can give pain to the feelings of any sincere believer in the established creed, I am sorry for it. The circumstances in which I am placed, must be my apology. It were hard indeed, if, in repelling an unjust aggression, I were not allowed, occasionally at

(6) Quoted by Wake, Discourse of the holy Eucharist, p. 66.

least, to aim a blow at my adversary. The blame, if blame there be, must rest with him who provoked the contest, and who has hitherto conducted it, I must say, with asperity and intemperance. If the learned prelate and his advocates are still determined to continue the discussion, why should it not be continued in the spirit of Christian moderation, and Christian charity? Let them recollect, that some respect is due to the opinions and feelings of the majority of the Christian world. Let them not arrogate to themselves the exclusive possession of intellect and knowledge: nor, on the credit of a superiority to which they have no claim, presume to treat their adversaries with insolence and contempt. Above all, let them be true: let them state our doctrine as it is: and then, if they can, let them refute it with temperance and candour. Controversy, conducted in this manner, will be no disgrace to its authors, and may contribute to the discovery or propagation of truth: but if they refuse to condescend to so equitable a request, they must abide the consequences. I trust the catholic body will always contain writers both able and willing to teach illiberality to blush, and to expose the artifices of misrepresentation.

APPENDIX.

WE learn from the mythology of the ancients, that Jason had no sooner sown the teeth of the dragon, than each tooth grew up into a warrior. In like manner the right reverend prelate preached his charge, and from each paragraph seems to have started a champion. Already have I had to encounter Elijah Index, and the Durham Clergyman, and Mr. Faber, and Mr. Le Mesurier, and the Bishop of Durham,

Stiphelumque, Bromumque,

Antimachumque, Helimumque, securiferumque Pyracmon.

Now to this phalanx of worthies I have to add a new hero, a parochial minister of the diocese of Durham. This gentleman conceives himself selected by Heaven as a second David to encounter the popish man of Gath: and, in imitation of his prototype, advances into the field with five stones in his scrip, which he denominates letters (1), and with which he threatens to break the head of his uncircumcised antagonist. Now, though I am not very apprehensive as to the issue of the contest, I must beg permission to enter my protest against the principle on which it has been undertaken. The modern David is not commissioned by Saul, but by himself: he believes himself bound by his ordination to attack me. But the principle equally applies to every clergyman of the established church; and were it once admitted, every clergyman of the established church would be embattled against me: thousands of arms would be raised to throw their stones at me: and I must inevitably sink under

(1) See a Defence of the Doctrine and Worship of the Church of England, in Five Letters addressed to the Author of a Letter to a Clergyman of the Diocese of Durham, p. 2. When I consider the number of writers who have undertaken to refute the Remarks on the Bishop of Durham's Charge, I begin to suspect that there is something more in that little tract than appears at first sight.

French were beaten *υπο των Αγγλων, ανευ ιματιων* but not *υπω των Αγγλων των ανευ ιματιων*, by the English—without clothes;—but not by the English that were without clothes. If by this illustration I shall have contributed to render the solifidian doctrine less liable to be misinterpreted, I shall think I have served the cause of morality.

According to the catholic doctrine, “we are saved by faith, which worketh by love.” This doctrine is Scriptural (4), and is not contradictory to the explanations which we give of it. It perhaps had been well if the new apostles had adopted it: but then they would not have had the merit of reforming. It was, therefore, resolved that we should be justified by faith only (5), though St. James says, we are not justified by faith only (6). The magnanimity of Luther made light of the difficulty. The writer of that epistle, he exclaimed, is a blockhead: it shall no longer be a part of the Scriptures: and expunged it from his Bible. But our Reformers were still more magnanimous. They declared that the article should be orthodox doctrine, and that the epistle should still be Scripture. To their successors they left the important task of reconciling them together.

With this short answer I must request my new antagonist to be satisfied. Without meaning any disrespect to him, I must be allowed to attend to the bishop. That prelate has threatened to send his clergy several more letters similar to the last; and it would be indecorous in me to leave the diocesan for the parochial minister.

(4) Gal. v. 6.

(5) Article 11.

(6) St. James, 11. 24.

FINIS.





